



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/055,580 | 01/22/2002 | Jin-Yuan Lee | MEGP0003USA | 6089 |

27765 7590 11/26/2008
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

MITCHELL, JAMES M

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2813

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

11/26/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/055,580 | Applicant(s) LEE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner JAMES M. MITCHELL | Art Unit 2813 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 92,97,99,101,104,106-109,118,120-123,125-129,151,152,154 and 156-165 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 92,97,99,101,104,106-109,118,120-123,125-129,151,152,154 and 156-165.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed July 21, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 92, 97, 101, 104, 106, 107, 109, 118, 120-123, 126-129 and 163 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrell (U.S. 6,013,571) in combination with Ohuchi (U.S. 2002/0033525).

5. Morrell (e.g. Fig. 3, 4) discloses:

Art Unit: 2813

(cl. 92, 120) A substrate (14) and a first pad (32) and a bonding structure on a chip comprising a pad (16) having a top surface (e.g. plane mechanically contacting 50) with a first region (e.g. left portion, 16, under 46), a second region (e.g. right portion, 16, under 46), and a third region between said first and second regions (e.g. center portion contacting 20) and over the pad, and a passivation layer (46) on (e.g. covering) said first and second regions, a metal layer (50) on said third region, over (e.g. above) said passivation layer and over said first and second regions; a copper pillar (24; Col. 2, Line 16-19) on said metal layer, over said passivation and over said first and second regions, wherein said third region is at a top of a second opening in the passivation layer (e.g. opening in said passivation exposes said third region); a copper pillar (24) between third region and said first pad, wherein said copper pillar is connected to said third region through said second opening and to said first pad, said metal layer (50) is between copper (24) and said third region (opening in 46 exposing pad, 16) between copper pillar and said passivation, between said copper and said first region and between said copper and said second region (Fig. 3), wherein said pillar is connected through said metal layer, a tin containing cap/layer (30; Col. 3, Lines 51-53 & 65-66) over said copper pillar; said cap having a first vertical thickness less than a second vertical thickness of said copper pillar (e.g. Fig. 3); (cl. 121) said tin cap is directly on said copper pillar (Fig. 3);

(cl. 101) with a conductive layer (9162) between the cap and copper pillar wherein second thickness is greater than a third thickness;

Art Unit: 2813

(cl. 104) the tin cap has a melting point less than copper (e.g. its solder)

(cl. 106, 123) the metal layer comprises titanium (Col. 3, Lines 1-8);

(cl. 107, 127) metal layer comprises titanium-tungsten (col. 3, Lines 1-5);

(cl. 109, 128) where metal layer comprise copper (Col. 3, Lines 1-5);

(cl. 118, 121) wherein tin is directly on said copper pillar (28 on 24)

(cl. 126) a conductive layer (162) between said copper pillar and tin cap (e.g.

130) wherein a second vertical thickness is greater than a third vertical thickness of the conductive layer;

(cl. 129) the tin cap has a melting point less than that of said copper pillar (Col. 4, Lines 4, Lines 1-3).

6. Morrell does not appear to show explicit use of a solder mask or that its tin cap comprised silver or copper.

7. However, Ohuchi teaches use of a solder mask (11).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the substrate of Morrel to include a mask in order to protect the substrate as taught by Ohuchi (Par. 0079).

9. With respect to Morrel cap, Morrel discloses the same invention as claimed except that its tin cap comprises lead instead of silver or copper. Ohuchi (Par. 0044) shows that Sn/Pb and Sn/ Ag produce equivalent structures known in the art. Therefore, because these materials are art recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute Sn/Ag for Sn/Pb.

Art Unit: 2813

10. Furthermore, Sn/ Ag is a known material for providing eutectic solders as exemplified by Ohuchi (Par. 0044). As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select Sn/Ag as an alternate eutectic solder, since it has been held that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

11. With respect to claim 122 that the cap has a thickness across axis of the body and therefore a traverse dimension less than that of the copper pillar, applicant has not disclosed that the selected dimension is for a particular unobvious purpose, produces an unexpected result, or is otherwise critical. As such, the selected dimension would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, since it has been held that mere dimensional limitations are prima facie obvious absent a disclosure that the limitations are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical. See, for example, *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

12. With respect to the process limitation of claims 97 and 163 that the copper is electroplated, the prior art forms the same structure as claimed. Although Morrell discloses plating of its pillar (Col. 3, Lines 24-26), claim 163 is a product-by-process therefore patentability does not depend on its process. “[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process,

Art Unit: 2813

determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

13. Claims 99 and 165 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrell (U.S. 6,013,571) and Ohuchi (U.S. 2002/0033525) as applied to claims 92 and 120 and further in combination with Hozoji et al. (U.S. 2002/0079575).

14. Neither Morrell nor Ohuchi appear to disclose a solder material being tin comprising copper.

15. However, Hozoji teaches use of bumps of tin comprising copper to mount chips (Par. 0104).

16. TiN comprising copper is a known material for connecting chips as exemplified above. As such, its selection would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, since it has been held that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination. Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp., 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

Art Unit: 2813

17. Claims 108 and 125 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrell (U.S. 6,013,571) and Ohuchi (U.S. 2002/0033525) as applied to claims 92 and 120 and further in combination with Fang (U.S. 2002/0095784).

18. Neither Morrell or Ohuchi disclose that its metal layer is chromium.

19. Fang teaches use of chromium metal layer ("UBM"; 308; Par .0029).

20. Because use of chromium is known in the art for providing underlying metal layers, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to select the claimed material, since it has been held that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

21. Claims 151, 152, 154, 157, 159-162 and 164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrell (U.S. 6,013,571).

22. Morrell (e.g. Fig. 3, 4) discloses elements from paragraph 5 of this office action including:

(cl. 151) A bonding structure on a chip comprising a pad (16) having a top surface (e.g. plane mechanically contacting 50) with a first region (e.g. left portion, 16, under 46), a second region (e.g. right portion, 16, under 46), and a third region between said first and second regions (e.g. center portion contacting 20), and a passivation layer (46) on (e.g. covering) said first and second regions, wherein an opening in said passivation layer is over said third region and

Art Unit: 2813

exposes said third region: a metal layer (50) on said third region, over (e.g. above) said passivation layer and over said first and second regions; a copper pillar (24; Col. 2, Line 16-19) on said metal layer, over said passivation and over said first and second regions; over said pad; and a tin containing cap (30; Col. 3, Lines 51-53 & 65-66) over said copper pillar; said cap having a first vertical thickness less than a second vertical thickness of said copper pillar (e.g. Fig. 3); (cl. 152) said tin cap is directly on said copper pillar (Fig. 3); (cl. 154) the metal layer comprises titanium (Col. 3, Lines 1-8); (cl. 159) a conductive layer (162) between said copper pillar and tin cap (e.g. 130) wherein a second vertical thickness is greater than a third vertical thickness of the conductive layer; (cl. 160) the metal layer comprises titanium-tungsten (Col. 3, Lines 1-8); (cl. 157, 161) the metal layer comprise copper (Col. 3, Lines 1-8); (cl. 162) the tin cap has a melting point less than that of said copper pillar (Col. 4, Lines 1-3).

23. With respect to claim 151 that the cap has a thickness across Y axis of the body and therefore a traverse dimension less than that of the copper pillar, applicant has not disclosed that the selected dimension is for a particular unobvious purpose, produces an unexpected result, or is otherwise critical. As such, the selected dimension would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, since it has been held that mere dimensional limitations are prima facie obvious absent a disclosure that the limitations are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical. See, for

Art Unit: 2813

example, *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

24. With respect to the process limitation of claims 163 and 164 that the copper is electroplated, the prior art forms the same structure as claimed. Although Morrell discloses plating of its pillar (Col. 3, Lines 24-26), claim 163 is a product-by-process therefore patentability does not depend on its process. “[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

25. Claim 156 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrell (U.S. 6,013,571) as applied to claim 151 and further in combination with Fang (U.S. 2002/0095784).

26. Morrell does not disclose that its metal layer is chromium.

27. Fang teaches use of chromium metal layer (“UBM”; 308; Par .0029).

28. Because use of chromium is known in the art for providing underlying metal layers, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to select

Art Unit: 2813

the claimed material, since it has been held that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

29. Claim 158 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrell (U.S. 6,013,571) as applied to claim 151 and further in combination with Hozoji et al. (U.S. 2002/0079575).

30. Morrell does not appear to disclose its solder material being tin comprising silver and copper.

31. However, Hozoji teaches use of bumps of tin comprising copper to mount chips (Par. 0104).

32. TiN comprising silver and copper is a known material for connecting chips as exemplified above. As such, its selection would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, since it has been held that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

33. Claims 161 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrell (U.S. 6,013,571) as applied to claim 151 and further in combination with Ohuchi (U.S. 2002/0033525).

Art Unit: 2813

34. Morrell discloses the same invention as claimed including a copper layer over Sn/Pb. This is the same as the claimed invention except that its tin cap comprises lead instead of silver.

35. Ohuchi (Par. 0044) shows that Sn/Pb and Sn/ Ag produce equivalent structures known in the art. Therefore, because these materials are art recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute Sn/Ag for Sn/Pb.

36. Furthermore, Sn/ Ag is a known material for providing eutectic solders as exemplified by Ohuchi (Par. 0044). As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select Sn/Ag as an alternate eutectic solder, since it has been held that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

Response to Arguments

37. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES M. MITCHELL whose telephone number is (571)272-1931. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mathew Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1907. The

Art Unit: 2813

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

November 21, 2008
/James M. Mitchell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2813